

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,949	02/19/2002	Ebrahim Zandi	13761-7064	6542
7590 06/30/2004			EXAMINER	
Jennifer M. Phelps			PROUTY, REBECCA E	
McCutchen, De	oyle, Brown & Enersen, L	LLP		
18th Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Three Embarcadero Center			1652	
San Francisco, CA 94111			DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/079,949	ZANDI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Rebecca E. Prouty	1652
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature than the period for reply will, by stature than the period for the provided by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a ply within the statutory minimum of thi d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a)    This action is <b>FINAL</b> .    2b)    This action for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal mat	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ccepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  Its have been received in A ority documents have beer au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	_ ′	
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 

Application/Control Number: 10/079,949
Art Unit: 1652

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-23, drawn to a method of reconstituting IKK in yeast, classified in class 435, subclass 194.
- II. Claims 23-28, drawn to an IKK complex, classified in class 435, subclass 194.
- III. Claims 29-21, drawn to a yeast transformed with an IKK subunit gene, classified in class 435, subclass 254.2.
- IV. Claims 32-37, drawn to methods of identifying upstream regulators of IKK, classified in class 435, subclass
  6.
- V. Claims 38-40, drawn to methods for assaying IKK activity, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant

Application/Control Number: 10/079,949

Art Unit: 1652

case the IKK complex can be made by chemical synthesis of the subunits and *in vitro* reconstitution.

Inventions III and I, IV or V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the yeast cells can be used for screening for IKK inhibitors.

The methods of Groups I, IV, and V are independent as they comprise different steps, utilize different products and produce different results.

The protein complex of Group II and the yeast cells of Group III are independent products which comprise unrelated chemical structures and use.

Inventions II and IV or V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product

Application/Control Number: 10/079,949

Art Unit: 1652

(MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the IKK complex can be used for inducing antibodies.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all

Application/Control Number: 10/079,949
Art Unit: 1652

the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to

Application/Control Number: 10/079,949

Art Unit: 1652

retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rebecca Prouty, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapura Achutamurthy, can be reached at (571) 272-0928. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Rebecca Prouty Primary Examiner Art Unit 1652

Eleca Kirt